

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alcassedan, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/031,794	01/17/2002	Aviv Refuah	NETEX-P4-US (35817)	1240	
	7590 01/04/201 CHONG FLAHERTY &	EXAMINER			
570 LEXINGTON AVENUE FLOOR 17 NEW YORK, NY 10022-6894			KE, PENG		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2174			
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/04/2011	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jbroitman@ocfblaw.com lmurrell@ocfblaw.com dflaherty@ocfblaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Ī	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/031,794	REFUAH, AVIV				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	SIMON KE	2174				

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 December 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

The period for reply expires on; (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b), ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706,07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed. may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS

_							
3 X	The proposed :	amendment(s) t	filed after a fina	Lrejection, but	t prior to the date	of filing a brief.	will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below):
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

- The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFB 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
 - 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s)
 - 7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) X will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:

Claim(s) objected to:

Claim(s) rejected: _ Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered

because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

- 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
- 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
- 11. M The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
- Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

13. Other: _____.

/Pena Ke/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2174 Continuation of 3, NOTE: "display of an effect..., while the user continues to employ siad browser" has not been presented before.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Based on applicant's response filed on 12/06/10, application has misunderstood the examiner's interpretation of the limitation in question. The examiner has interpretation for the limitation in question. The examiner has interpretation for the examiner has the examiner has the examiner has the examiner has the program from the browser, but a HTML page that is displayed within the browser. Examiner's interpretation is full supported by applicant pescelification and figures. In the response file on 5/15/10, applicant replied on page 10 and figure 1 of specification for support of the limitation in question. In both instances, there is no showing of an executing program that is separate from the browser, (see Application's perfection) page 10 and figure1) Instead, both instances show a HTML page that is displayed within a browser. (see Applicant's specification page 10 and fig. 1) Therefore the limitation is taught by Estabrok page 132, fig. 9.4 and fig. 9.5.